

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

FILED

SEP 10 2010

ROBERT D. DENNIS, CLERK
U.S. DIST. COURT, WESTERN DIST. OF OKLA.
BY *uk* DEPUTY

PAUL and TAMMY MAUS, individually and)
as parents and next friend of A.C., a minor)
child, et al.,)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.)

No. CIV-07-1323-W

NORMAN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT,)
Independent School District No. 29 of)
Cleveland County, Oklahoma, et al.,)

Defendants.)

ORDER

On September 3, 2010, the Court granted the defendants' Motion to Extend Deadline [Doc. 224] filed on September 3, 2010, and directed the plaintiffs to provide to the defendants no later than 6:00 p.m., Friday, September 3, 2010, the following:

- (a) copies of all exhibits in support of the plaintiffs' Objection and Response to Defendant Wolfe's Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support [Doc. 216]; and
- (b) copies of all exhibits in support of the plaintiffs' Objection and Response to Defendant Stanford's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 221]. See Doc. 225.

The matter then came before the Court on the Motion to Strike Objections and Responses, or in the Alternative, Compel Production of Exhibits [Doc. 235] filed on September 8, 2010, by defendants Marilyn Wolfe and Kimberly Stanford. These defendants asserted that the plaintiffs had failed to comply with the Court's Order of September 3, 2010, and had not provided certain exhibits that supported the plaintiffs' responses to their Motions for Summary Judgment.

Wolfe, in particular, contended that the plaintiffs had failed to provide full and accurate copies of Exhibits 3 and 7 as well as failed to provide copies of Exhibits 14 and 15 to their response to her Motion for Summary Judgment. Stanford contended that the plaintiffs had failed to provide copies of Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 to their response to her Motion for Summary Judgment.


The Court directed the plaintiffs to respond to the assertions and arguments advanced by Wolfe and Stanford, and having now reviewed the plaintiffs' response thereto and having been advised that Wolfe and Stanford have now received copies of all exhibits submitted in support of the plaintiffs' responses to their Motions for Summary Judgment, the Court

(1) DENIES the Motion to Strike Objections and Responses [Doc. 235] filed by Wolfe and Stanford on September 8, 2010;

(2) deems MOOT these defendants' alternate Motion Compel Production of Exhibits [Doc. 235] also filed on September 8, 2010; and

(3) DIRECTS Wolfe and Stanford to file their replies on or before September 15, 2010.

ENTERED this 10th day of September, 2010.


LEE R. WEST
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE